

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 10, 18 and 19 are amended. No new matter has been added.

I. No New Matter is Added

Claims 1, 10 and 19 have been amended to recite, "wherein one of the at least two workflow modules is associated with a user that performs one or more tasks to produce one or more documents that are managed by a workflow module according to subject matter in one or more documents." Claims 1, 10 and 19 have also been amended to recite, "a plurality of workflow modules, that can be added or removed." Support for these amendment can be found in the specification of the present application in paragraphs [0010] and [0020] - [0027]. No new matter is added by this amendment. Claims 9 and 18 have been amended to recite wherein one of the plurality of operating behaviors are rated as one of: "very reliable," "reliable," "unreliable," and "very unreliable." No new matter is added by this amendment.

II. Interview

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representatives by Examiner Liu and Supervisor Cardone in the May 13, 2008 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. During the interview, the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 10 and 19, and the 35 USC 112 ¶1 rejection were discussed. Also, a potential 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of claims 1, 10 and 19 was discussed.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1

Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action asserts that the limitation "wherein the plurality of operating behaviors are very reliable, reliable, unreliable and very unreliable" on page 2 of the Office Action, is not supported by the specification at

page 29, paragraph [0061]. The Office Action asserts that the specification states that "the repositories or sources can be classified as being one of a predefined number of operating behaviors [e.g., very reliable, reliable, unreliable, and very unreliable]." The Office Action requests that claims 9 and 18 be amended. Claims 9 and 18 are amended to recite wherein one of the plurality of operating behaviors are rated as one of: "very reliable", "reliable", "unreliable", and very "unreliable." As discussed during the personal interview, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph 1 is overcome. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Arregui (EP 1111518 A1) (hereinafter "Arregui"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 10 and 19

The Office Action cites Arregui page 5, paragraph [0023] as teaching that there are at least two workflow modules associated with a user that perform one or more tasks to produce one or more documents. Arregui teaches the ability of a user to select between e-mail, fax, printer as delivery modules for receiving a document. However, Arregui does not disclose a workflow process that manages the flow of documents according to the subject matter described in the documents. As agreed to during the personal interview, Arregui fails to disclose "at least one or more documents that are managed by a workflow module according to subject matter described in the one or more document," as recited in claims 1, 10 and 19. As stated in paragraph 23 and 24 of Arregui, the ability for a user to select e-mail, fax or printer as delivery modules focuses on how an user can receive a document. This is not the same as the Applicant's solution where a workflow module is set up independently and processes documents based on subject matter. **Also, Applicant's solution allows for the addition and removal of workflow modules. This is also not disclosed by Arregui.**

Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 10 and 19 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9, 11-18 and 20

Because claims 1, 10 and 19 are allowable, the claims dependent therefrom are also patentable over the applied reference for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with the independent claims, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1-20 be withdrawn.

V. Potential 35 U.S.C. §101 Issue

During the personal interview, Supervisor Cardone inquired as to whether the document repository cited in claim 1 is software or hardware, and indicated that a claim directed to software would result in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Fig. 1 indicates that a document repository is hardware. Also, paragraph 17 of the specification indicates that the document repository is part of a document server. Thus, a rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §101 would not be proper as the claim is directed to statutory subject matter.

VI. Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Abdul Q. Basit
Registration No. 61,788

JAO:AQB/tbm

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: May 27, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--